Serial No. 10/636,004

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of: August 24, 2009

Bourges-Waldegg   Group Art Unit: 2109

Serial No. 10/636,004   Examiner: Mark Fearer

Filed: August 7, 2003   IBM Corporation
                                         Anne Vachon Dougherty
Title: ELECTRONIC DEVICE, METHOD   3173 Cedar Road
FOR ROUTING AN ELECTRONIC MESSAGE   Yorktown Hts, NY 10598
FROM AN ELECTRONIC DEVICE TO AN
OUTPUT UNIT, AND COMPUTER PROGRAM ELEMENT

Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

REPLY BRIEF

    Appellants hereby respond to the Examiner's Answer

dated June 22, 2009 in the above-identified application.

The arguments presented by Applicants (hereinafter

"Appellants") in the Appeal Brief dated January 14, 2009,

are hereby incorporated by reference herein. Appellants

will respond herein to the arguments raised by the Examiner

in Section 10, pp. 11-13, of the present Examiner's Answer

(hereinafter "Answer"). Appellants note that all other

arguments presented by the Examiner in Section 9 have

already been addressed by Appellants in the original Appeal Brief and will not be reiterated. Appellants are not conceding that the Examiner has overcome those arguments. Appellants respectfully request that the Board of Appeals consider those arguments, in addition to the arguments presented herein.

(11) RESPONSE TO "RESPONSE TO ARGUMENTS"

The Examiner disagrees with the Appellants contention that Janik does not teach or suggest an electronic device having a plurality of interfaces for connecting message rendering output units to the device. As previously argued, Janik clearly shows a single network interface (50 of Fig. 1). Appellants further assert that Janik as modified by Gibbs and Nabkel does not disclose the claimed device having a plurality of interface for connecting message rendering output units to the device. The Examiner cites the Gibbs' paragraph 0022. Appellants disagree that paragraph 0022 teaches a plurality of interfaces for connecting message rendering output units to a device. Paragraph 0022 of Gibbs is a "catch-all" paragraph stating that the functionality of the Gibbs

invention "can be achieved in any of a variety of ways", such that it can be implemented with different operating systems, using different languages, programs, protocols, etc. Gibbs is not teaching or suggesting the concurrent use of all of those listed system features. Rather, Gibbs is making a blanket statement that the invention can be implemented in systems having different system features. Appellants again point out that none of the Gibbs figures or paragraphs disclose a plurality of interfaces. Clearly Gibbs does not teach or suggest a plurality of physical interfaces connecting output units to a device.

Next the Examiner disagrees with the Appellants contention that Janik, as modified by Gibbs and Nabkel, does not teach or suggest a control unit for controlling the routing of messages based on results of an automatic and dynamic message classification process based on at least one of message content analysis, presentability, sender and confidentiality level. The Examiner cites paragraph 0170 of Janik which expressly lists tags and other message objects which are pre-defined in a message. Janik uses the tags, URL or IP address, time, date or user identifier for message handling. Appellants again argue that Janik's use of pre-defined objects is not the same as or suggestive of

automatic, dynamic message classification. Moreover, the Examiner's reliance on the Janik teaching (also found in paragraph 0170) of the use of tag buttons for transmitting messages back through the LAN seems to support Appellants' contention that Janik teaches routing based on pre-defined message objects to transmit messages to user-selected locations. The Janik teachings simply do not support a conclusion that routing based on dynamic, automatic message classification is obvious.

CONCLUSION

Appellants respectfully assert that the Examiner has erred in rejecting Claims 1-3, 8-11 and 16-19. Appellants request that the decisions of the Examiner be overturned by the Board and that the claims be passed to issuance.

Respectfully submitted,
Bourges-Waldegg, et al

By: /Anne Vachon Dougherty/

Anne Vachon Dougherty
Registration No. 30,374
Tel. (914) 962-5910

APPENDIX OF CLAIMS

1. An electronic user device, comprising:

a receiving component for receiving message intended for said user;

a plurality of interfaces for connecting message rendering output units to said device,

a control unit for controlling the routing of messages, said messages being determined to be presented to a user of said device via at least one of said message rendering output units, said control unit being configured for:

    automatically determining at least one of said message rendering output units for routing a message to based on a results of an automatic message classification process wherein said message classification process comprises analysis of said message and dynamic classification of said message based on at least one of message content analysis, presentability, sender and confidentiality level, and

    routing said message to an interface serving said determined message rendering output unit.

2. The electronic user device as recited in claim 1, further comprising a stored look-up table with confidentiality classification levels being allocated to message rendering output units.

3. The electronic user device as recited in claim 1, further comprising a classification unit for running said classification process for classifying messages to be output.

4-7 (canceled)

8. The electronic user device as recited in claim 1, comprising an identification unit for identifying available connected message rendering output units and for making said control unit determine only one or more of said identified available message rendering output units for message routing.

9. The electronic user device as recited in claim 1, wherein said electronic device is a portable device.

10. A method for routing an electronic message from an electronic user device to a message rendering output unit, comprising automatically controlled steps of:

automatically determining at least one of several message rendering output units based on a result of a message classification process, wherein said message classification process comprises analysis of said message and dynamic classification of said message based on at least one of message content analysis, presentability, sender and confidentiality level, and initiating said message to be routed to said determined message rendering output unit for presenting said message to said user of said electronic user device.

11. The method as recited in claim 10, wherein said message is classified according to confidentiality classification levels and said classification result is provided.

12-15. (canceled)

16. The method as recited in claim 10, wherein the availability of message rendering output units is checked, and wherein only one or more of the available message rendering output units can be determined for message routing.

17. A program storage device readable by a digital processing apparatus at an electronic user device and having a program of instructions which are tangibly embodied on the storage device and which are executable by the processing apparatus to perform a method of routing an electronic message received by said electronic user device from the electronic user device to at least one of a plurality of message rendering output units, said method comprising:

     automatically determining at least one of said message rendering output units based upon a message classification process, wherein said message classification process comprises analysis of said message and dynamic classification of said message based on at least one of message content analysis, presentability, sender and confidentiality level, and initiating said message to be routed to said determined message rendering output unit for

presenting said message to a user of said electronic device.

18. The program storage device as recited in claim 17, wherein said message is classified according to confidentiality classification levels and said classification result is provided.

19. The program storage device as recited in claim 17, wherein the availability of message rendering output units is checked, and wherein only one or more of the available message rendering output units can be determined for message routing.

EVIDENCE APPENDIX

There is no additional evidence for this matter.

RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

There are no related proceedings.